

09/18/99

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

REC'D 18 APR 2001

WIPO

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

14

Applicant's or agent's file reference PF-0633 PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. PCT/US99/26048	International filing date (day/month/year) 04 NOVEMBER 1999	Priority date (day/month/year) 04 NOVEMBER 1998
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC IPC(7): C12Q 1/68 and US Cl.: 435/6		
Applicant INCYTE PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.		

1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.
2. This REPORT consists of a total of 4 sheets.
- ☐ This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority. (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).

These annexes consist of a total of 0 sheets.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the report
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☐ Non-establishment of report with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand 01 JUNE 2000	Date of completion of this report 22 MARCH 2001
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Box PCT Washington, D.C. 20231	Authorized officer <i>Gary Jones</i> GARY JONES
Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Telephone No. (703) 308-0196

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/US99/26048

I. Basis of the report**1. With regard to the elements of the international application:***☒ the international application as originally filed☒ the description:

pages 1-72 , as originally filed
pages NONE , filed with the demand
pages NONE , filed with the letter of _____

☒ the claims:

pages 73-74 , as originally filed
pages NONE , as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
pages NONE , filed with the demand
pages NONE , filed with the letter of _____

☒ the drawings:

pages 1-12 , as originally filed
pages NONE , filed with the demand
pages NONE , filed with the letter of _____

☒ the sequence listing part of the description:

pages 1-48 , as originally filed
pages NONE , filed with the demand
pages NONE , filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☒ contained in the international application in printed form.
☒ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☒ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☒ the description, pages NONE
☒ the claims, Nos. NONE
☒ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE

5. ☐ This report has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).**

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17).

**Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/US99/26048

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. statement

Novelty (N)

Claims 17-18 YESClaims 1-16, 19-20 NO

Inventive Step (IS)

Claims NONE YESClaims 1-20 NO

Industrial Applicability (IA)

Claims 1-20 YESClaims NONE NO

2. citations and explanations (Rule 70.7)

Claims 1-16 and 19-20 novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Halleck et al. or alternatively by Stanchi et al.

Both teach sequences which would correspond to the "fragments" of the claims, because no specific length of the fragment is disclosed and therefore this would have included even one individual base. Also, the art teaches polynucleotides, polypeptides, antibodies, and a method for detecting.

Claims 17-18 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Halleck and Stanchi et al. This is because the claims teach an agonist and an antagonist to the polypeptide. This would have been obvious because it was well known in the art at the time of the invention that agonists and antagonists were readily obtainable to a known polypeptide and many known substances would have been able to serve as such.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----
NONE

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/US99/26048

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of: Boxes I - VIII

Sheet 10